



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/298,538 04/22/99 CANOVA,

F 15886-210

EXAMINER

WM02/0705

HENRY J. GROTH
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROASTI
650 PAGE MILL ROAD.
PALO ALTO CA 94304-1050

NELSON, A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2675

DATE MAILED:

07/05/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/298,538

Applicant(s)
Canova Et Al.

Examiner
Alecia Nelson

Art Unit
2675



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 13, 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6, 16, and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6, 16, and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 20) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2675

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. ***Claims 1, 6, 16, and 26*** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Samuels (U.S. Patent No. 5,270,821) in view of Carroll et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,121,960) and Ike (U.S. Patent No. 5,153,756).

With reference to **claims 1 and 16**, Samuels teaches a processor (24) disposed in a video display apparatus (10) receiving an activation signal for viewing parameter control from a first input mechanism, the activation signal corresponds to a interaction with the first input mechanism

Art Unit: 2675

(see column 11, lines 39-45). Responsive to the activation signal, a program displaying graphical user interface elements adapted for viewing parameter control on the image screen (see column 4, lines 18-21), the processor receiving an adjustment signal indicating adjustment from prior values of the viewing parameter to new values of the viewing parameter (see column 4, lines 22-25), and responsive to receiving the adjustment signal, the processor adjusting the values of the viewing parameter for the image screen to the new value (see column 4, lines 26-36).

Samuels fails to specifically teach the usage of a portable computer, and that the adjustment of the viewing parameter is carried out by adjusting the image screen drive voltages being applied to the pixels to the new values and thereby adjusting the image.

Carroll et al. teaches a portable computer apparatus in which it is possible to include contrast adjustment buttons represented on the touch screen itself but possibly on a housing of the touch screen (see column 4, lines 25-30).

Ike teaches a liquid crystal display apparatus which detects and regulates its display contrast. The contrast detecting unit (4) detects a difference between the inputted voltage or current signals from the pair of photosensors (3a, 3b), and it produces a converted electric signal according to the detected difference to a voltage control unit (5). The voltage control unit (5) operates according to the inputted electrical signal so as to control an output voltage of a stabilized power supply unit (6). The stabilized power supply unit (6) is constructed to supply a drive voltage to be applied to the liquid crystal display panel (2) (see column 2, lines 14-24). The control unit (5) operates to control the drive voltages applied to the liquid crystal display panel.

Art Unit: 2675

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine a voltage control unit receptive of a signal for producing a control signal effective to control a drive voltage applied to the liquid crystal display unit, as taught by Ike, to a portable device with on-screen video display adjustment, as taught by Samuels, to thereby provide a portable device, as taught by Carroll et al., with contrast control in which the intensity difference is substantially maximized to thereby provide an optimum contrast of the display.

With reference to **claims 6 and 26**, Carroll et al. further teaches a screen peripheral system including a computing device for producing a main image and a touch-activated input device for generating and displaying a composite image visible to a user, in which variable-pixel controls, can be provided to change the thickness, brightness of the keyboard representation (see column 4, lines 10-17), the keyboard representing one group of pixels. It is also taught that contrast adjustment buttons are preferably represented on the touch screen itself to adjust the contrast between the keyboard and the main screen (see column 4, lines 25-30).

Carroll et al. fails to specifically teach that the one group of pixels covers less than approximately twenty-percent of the image screen or more than eighty-percent. However it is taught by Carroll et al. That twenty-five percent of the pixels are used to represent the keyboard and seventy-five percent of the pixels are used to represent the main image (see column 5, lines 39-44), and it is further stated that the keyboard, or the one group of pixels, can be moved and the percentage areas changed (see column 11, lines 56-57).

Art Unit: 2675

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine that which is taught by Carroll et al. to that which is taught by Samuels and Ike to thereby provide a portable computer apparatus in which the contrast of the one group of pixels can be changed without altering the rest of the display. This would thereby provide the user with the ability to make these adjustments accordingly and to also improve accuracy of drive voltages applied to the liquid crystal.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to *claims 1, 6, 16, and 26* have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 2023; or faxed to: (703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry) or: (703) 308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"). Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alecia D. Nelson whose telephone number is (703)305-0143 between the hours of 8:00 a.m and 5:00 p.m. on Monday-Friday.

Application/Control Number: 09/298538

Page 6

Art Unit: 2675

If attempts to reach the above examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Saras, can be reached at (703)305-9720.



STEVEN SARAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

adn/ADN
June 26, 2001